

## R E M A R K S

- Prior to the present amendment:
  - Claims 1 – 37 were pending.
- Upon entry of the present amendment, which is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth below:
  - Claims 2, 3, 5, 13, 14, 16, 24, 25, 27, 36 and 37 will be cancelled;
  - Claims 1, 4, 12, 15, 23, 26, 34 and 35 will be amended; and
  - The specification will be amended to correct an inadvertent error in the wording of a priority claim to a prior application.

### I. Objection to specification

Paragraph [0046] of the specification has been objected to for including the word “Bluetoot™” rather than the correctly spelled “Bluetooth™”. Applicants have been unable to find this error in the specification and therefore correct it herein. First, Applicants are confused as to the location of the misspelled “Bluetoot™” as noted by the Examiner – the Examiner describes the location as paragraph [0046] yet the specification as filed does not include any paragraph numbers. Second, Applicants searched the entirety of the specification and did not find any occurrence of the misspelled term “Bluetoot™”. If the Examiner maintains that this misspelled term is present in the specification, Applicants hereby grant the Examiner permission to correct the spelling of this term to “Bluetooth™” and to inform Applicants again of the location in the specification of the misspelled and corrected term.

### II. Objection to Claims

Claim 34 has been objected to as reciting the phrase “why a an outcome”. Applicants have corrected this typographical error herein and thank the Examiner for bringing it to Applicants’ attention.

### III. Claim Rejections – §102

Claims **1 – 6, 8, 10, 12 – 17, 19, 21, 23 – 28, 30, 32 and 35 – 37** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,695,696 to Kamikow (“Kamikow” herein).

Claims **1 – 8, 11 – 19, 22 – 30, 33 and 35 – 37** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication No. 2004/0192431 to Singer et al. (“Singer” herein).

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that claims **2, 3, 5, 13, 14, 16, 23, 25, 27, 36 and 37** have been cancelled herein, without prejudice or disclaimer. Consequently, Applicants have refrained herein to respond to the Examiner’s rejection regarding these claims.

#### **Independent Claims 1, 12, 23 and 35**

Each of claims **1, 12, 23 and 35** has been amended herein to recite the following feature that is not taught or suggested by either Kamikow or Singer:

*with respect to the second or supplemental display:*

- *wherein the set of outcome elements of each outcome is each displayed disposed along a straight line without crossing any other displayed line of outcome elements, even when the set of outcome elements of at least one of the plurality of outcomes is not displayed, via the first display, disposed along a straight line*

In other words, in accordance with one embodiment disclosed in the specification, not only are the outcomes displayed on a first display also displayed on the second display, but the outcomes as displayed on the second display are “reformatted or otherwise modified for improved

clarity" (specification, page 3, lines 13) as appropriate. For example, if an outcome as displayed via a first display is disposed along a path with twists and / or turns, it improves the clarity of the outcome to display it via a second display as disposed along a straight line.

The advantages of such reformatting and clarification have been recognized by Applicants to be significant. For example, as explained in the specification: "By simplifying information provided to players, the present invention allows complex gaming devices to be more accessible and thus, more popular with a broader range of players. In addition, the present invention expands the possibility of acceptance and popularity of games that have more complicated game outcomes than existing gaming devices." Specification, page 3, lines 17 – 21.

Neither Kamikow or Singer teaches or suggests reformatting an outcome, much less reformatting an outcome by displaying it disposed along a straight line via a second display even if it is not displayed disposed along a straight line via a first display. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims **1, 23 and 35** are now allowable over Kamikow and over Singer as well as the remainder of references of record.

### **Independent Claims 4, 15, and 26**

Each of claims **4, 15 and 26** (the only other independent claims of the claims rejected under §102) has been amended herein to recite the following feature that is not taught or suggested by either Kamikow or Singer:

*with respect to the second or supplemental display:*

- wherein the set of symbols displayed on the supplemental display are disposed along a linear

*payline even when the same set of symbols displayed*  
*on the display of the slot machine are displayed*  
*disposed along a payline that is not a linear payline*

As described with respect to claims **1, 12, 23 and 35** above, neither Kamikow nor Singer teaches or suggests reformatting an outcome displayed via a second display from a format the outcome is displayed in via a first display, much less reformatting by displaying via a second display an outcome disposed along a linear payline when the outcome is displayed via a first display disposed along a payline that is not a linear payline. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims **4, 15 and 26** (and all claims dependent therefrom) are allowable over Kamikow and over Singer.

#### IV. Claim Rejections – Section 103

Claims **7, 11, 18, 22, 29 and 33** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamikow in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,766,074 to Cannon et al. (“Cannon” herein).

Claims **9, 20 and 31** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamikow in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0060268 to Falconer (“Falconer” herein).

Applicants note that neither Cannon nor Falconer teaches or suggests either of the respective features discussed above. Each of the claims rejected under §103 is a dependent claim that depends from one of the independent claims that has been amended herein and that includes one of the two features discussed above with respect to the §102 rejections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims **7, 11, 18, 22, 29 and 33** as well as each of claims **9, 20 and 31** are

patentable for at least the same reasons as claims **1, 23 and 35** and claims **4, 15 and 26**, respectively.


## C O N C L U S I O N

For the foregoing reasons it is submitted that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's early re-examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is cordially requested to contact Magdalena M. Fincham at telephone number (203) 461-7041 or via electronic mail at [mfincham@walkerdigital.com](mailto:mfincham@walkerdigital.com).

Applicants do not believe any fee (e.g., for an extension of time with which to respond to the Office Action) or petition for an extension of time is required at this time. However, if a fee should be necessary for the present Application at this time (or any time during the prosecution of the present Application), please charge any such required fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-0271. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0271. Further, if a petition for any extension of time should be required, please grant such petition as appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,



Magdalena M. Fincham  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,085  
[mfincham@walkerdigital.com](mailto:mfincham@walkerdigital.com)  
(203) 461-7041/ voice  
(203) 461-7300 / fax

May 12, 2005

Date